

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested for claims 1-20.

The disclosure was objected to on the basis of various minor informalities. The disclosure has been amended to overcome the objection and withdrawal of the objection is cordially urged.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing the "hot runner" recited in the claims. Amended FIGS. 1 and 2 schematically show the hot runner 18. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is cordially urged.

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2001/0026817 to *Shida et al.* Claim 1, from which claims 2-7 and 9-20 depend, as amended, defines an injection mould for producing three-dimensional components, comprising a system for mould tempering having at least one groove which is arbitrarily extended between two points in an available volume of the mould for conducting a tempering medium which is intended for tempering of modules included in the mould, each groove being covered along essentially its entire extent by a cover.

Claim 8, as amended, system for mould tempering of injection moulds for producing three-dimensional components, comprising at least one groove which is arbitrarily extended between two points in an available volume of the mould for conducting a tempering medium which is intended for tempering of modules included in the mould, each groove being covered along essentially its entire length by a cover.

Shida et al. does not disclose the features or combination of features of claim 1 or claim 8, including a combination including a groove which is arbitrarily extended between two points in an available volume of the mould. The coolant grooves in *Shida et al.* do not extend arbitrarily but, rather, are precisely sized and spaced to avoid uneven distribution of heat and to avoid warping of the disks being manufactured. Also, the structure formed in the mold in *Shida et al.* is substantially two-dimensional.

In view of the differences between claim 1 and claim 8 and *Shida et al.* it is respectfully submitted that those claims and the claims dependent from claim 1 are not anticipated by *Shida et al.*

Claims 3, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shida et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,783,233 to *Takahashi*. *Takahashi et al.* is cited as disclosing seals positioned between modules but cures none of the defects of *Shida et al.* Also, it would not have been obvious to modify the coolant grooves of *Shida et al.* to extend arbitrarily because of the importance of uniform and precise cooling to the disclosed invention -- the modification would destroy the alleged invention of *Shida et al.* for its intended function. Accordingly, claim 1 from which claims 3, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, and 20 depend, defines patentably over *Shida et al.* and *Takahashi et al.*


It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, are in condition for allowance. Allowance is cordially urged.

If the Examiner should be of the opinion that a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: July 10, 2003

By: 
Harold R. Brown III
Registration No. 36,341

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

